



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/820,553

04/08/2004

Wilfried Fischer

29473/11372A

8366

4743 7590 04/09/2007  
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP  
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300  
SEARS TOWER  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

GILBERT, ANDREW M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3767

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

04/09/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/820,553

Applicant(s)

FISCHER ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew M. Gilbert

Art Unit

3767

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --****Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6,7,11-14 and 16-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6,7,11-14 and 16-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/16/2007 has been entered.

### ***Acknowledgements***

2. This office action is in response to the reply filed on 1/16/2007.
3. In the reply, the Applicant amended claims 1 and 16.
4. Additionally, the applicant submitted replacement drawings to obviate the objection to the drawings and correctly provided clarification to obviate the objection to the claims by noting that the "-", on In 3 really was a strickout of the comma indicating that the comma has been deleted from the claim.
5. Finally, the Applicant filed a terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejection; however, the terminal disclaimer has been disapproved, as the attorney is not of record. Thus, the double patenting rejection stands. The attorney, Michael Mucyznski (48,642) is not listed as an attorney of the record in the Oath and Declaration and there is no valid customer number provided in the Oath and Declaration or in any correspondence. The Examiner recommends two courses of action: 1) resubmit the Terminal Disclaimer and check box #1 on the terminal disclaimer form which indicates

Art Unit: 3767

that "For submissions on behalf of a business/organization ... the undersigned is empowered to act on behalf of the business/organization"; or 2) resubmit the Terminal Disclaimer and file a new form indicating the customer number (04743) for the case or filed a power of attorney indicating that Michael Mucyznski is an attorney of record for the case.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11-14, 16-27 are pending for examination.

***Claim Objections***

7. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1 recites the limitation "comprise" on ln 3. The Examiner believes the limitation should read "comprising". Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11-13, 16-20, 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Avarhami (6148232) in view of Hofmann et al (6192270).

10. In reference to independent claim 1, Avarhami discloses a transdermal delivery system comprising: a carrier layer (70) impermeable to a substance to be delivered and comprising one or more electrodes (Fig 1b; 58; col 12, lns39-42); a reservoir (74) containing said substance to be delivered, the reservoir being formed by a contact adhesive (74; col 12, lns 46-57; wherein the Examiner notes that the Examiner has

Art Unit: 3767

considered a contact adhesives to be any substance that adheres on contact and the disclosed reservoir of Avarhami is fully capable of being a contact adhesive as the reservoir (74) adheres to both sides of the electrode patch (70) in Fig 1b) and provided stacked between the carrier layer and one or more counter electrodes (70, 74, 120, Fig 1b); a battery (52); an integrated controller microchip that is fixed to the carrier layer and programmable to a prescription (30, 50, col 11, Ins 62-col 12, Ins 2; also see Fig 3, col 13, Ins 19-col 14, Ins 8); a reading and writing device (Fig 3; col 11, Ins 62-col 12, Ins 2; also see Fig 3, col 13, Ins 19-col 14, Ins 8).

11. In reference to independent claim 16, Avarhami discloses a transdermal delivery system comprising: a carrier layer (part of 70 on top of 74; Fig 1b) impermeable to a substance to be delivered; a membrane (part of 70 below of 74; Fig 1b) permeable to said substance to be delivered; a reservoir (74) containing said substance to be delivered, the reservoir being provided stacked between the carrier layer and the membrane (74, Fig 1b); a battery (50); an integrated controller microchip (30, 50, col 11, Ins 62-col 12, Ins 2; also see Fig 3, col 13, Ins 19-col 14, Ins 8) fixed to the carrier layer; and a reading and writing device (Fig 3; col 11, Ins 62-col 12, Ins 2; also see Fig 3, col 13, Ins 19-col 14, Ins 8), wherein the carrier layer and the membrane comprise one or more electrodes such that the one or more electrodes of the membrane serve(s) as counterelectrode(s) to the one or more electrodes of the carrier layer (Fig 1b; col 12, Ins 50-57).

12. In reference to claim 2 (see (Fig 2; col 12, Ins 66-col 13, Ins 19)); claim 4, 17 (see (col 14, Ins 1-35)); claim 6, 19 (see (col 14, Ins 62-63)); claim 7, 20 (see (Figs 2-3; col

Art Unit: 3767

13, Ins 1-col 14, ln 8)); claim 11, 24 (see (Fig 1b)); claim 12, 25 (see (col 11, Ins 62-col 12, Ins 2)); claim 13, 26 (see (52)); claim 18 (see (74; col 12, Ins 46-57)); claim 22 (see (Fig 2; 75, 60; col 13, Ins 1-35)); claim 23 (see (Fig 1b, 58, 120)).

13. However, Avarhami does not expressly disclosing a layer consisting of a pressure-sensitive contact adhesive applied to the side of the membrane remote from the reservoir or a removable film. Hoffman et al teaches that it is known to have a layer (col 3, Ins 31-54) consisting of a pressure-sensitive contact adhesive applied to the side of the membrane remote from the reservoir and a removable film (col 3, Ins 51-54) for the purpose of providing a protective cover that can be peeled off before use and adhesive to adhere to the skin of a patient (col 3, Ins 51-54). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device as taught by Avarhami with the adhesive and removable film as taught by Hofmann et al for the purpose of providing a protective cover that can be peeled off before use and adhesive to adhere the device to the patient during use (col 3, Ins 51-54).

14. Claim 1, 4, 12-13, 16-18, 21, 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corish et al (5533995) in view of Hofmann et al (6192270).

15. In reference to independent claim 1, Corish et al discloses a transdermal delivery system comprising: a carrier layer (23) impermeable to a substance to be delivered and comprising one or more electrodes (14); a reservoir (12) containing said substance to be delivered, the reservoir being formed by a contact adhesive (col 3, Ins 52-col 4, Ins

Art Unit: 3767

35) and provided stacked between the carrier layer and one or more counter electrodes (23, 12, 12, 13; Fig 1); a battery (17; col 5, Ins 57-62); an integrated controller microchip (18; col 6, Ins 9-13, 54-64; col 8, Ins 66-67) that is fixed to the carrier layer and programmable to a prescription; a reading and writing device (18; col 6, Ins 9-13, 54-64; col 8, Ins 66-67).

16. In reference to independent claim 16, Corish et al discloses a transdermal delivery system comprising: a carrier layer (23) impermeable to a substance to be delivered; a membrane (13) permeable to said substance to be delivered; a reservoir (12) containing said substance to be delivered, the reservoir being provided stacked between the carrier layer and the membrane (Fig 1); a layer (col 7, Ins 3-6) consisting of a pressure-sensitive contact adhesive applied to the side of the membrane remote from the reservoir; a battery (17); an integrated controller microchip (18; col 6, Ins 9-13, 54-64; col 8, Ins 66-67) fixed to the carrier layer; and a reading and writing device (18; col 6, Ins 9-13, 54-64; col 8, Ins 66-67), wherein the carrier layer and the membrane comprise one or more electrodes such that the one or more electrodes of the membrane serve(s) as counterelectrode(s) to the one or more electrodes of the carrier layer (col 8, Ins 29-39).

17. In reference to claim 4, 17 (see (col 3, Ins 22-29)); claim 12, 25 (see (18; col 6, Ins 9-13, 54-64; col 8, Ins 66-67)); claim 13, 26 (see (col 5, Ins 58-62)); claim 18 (see (col 3, Ins 52-col 4, Ins 35)); claim 21 (see (col 8, Ins 12-18)).

18. However, Corish et al does not expressly disclosing a removable film. Hoffman et al teaches that it is known to have a removable film (col 3, Ins 51-54) for the purpose of

Art Unit: 3767

providing a protective cover that can be peeled off before use (col 3, lns 51-54). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device as taught by Corish et al with the removable film as taught by Hofmann et al for the purpose of providing a protective cover that can be peeled off before use (col 3, lns 51-54).

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

19. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11-14, 16-27 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6757560. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the pending application is merely more



Art Unit: 3767

broad to the patented parent application and it has been held that the broader invention is anticipated by the narrow patented parent application.

***Response to Arguments***

20. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11-14, 16-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Reller et al (5002527); Korenstein et al (5964726); Hofmann et al (6748265); Muroki (5944685); Palti (2001/0023330); and Zhang et al (6340472).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew M. Gilbert whose telephone number is (571) 272-7216. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Sirmons can be reached on (571)272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3767

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Andrew Gilbert

KEVIN C. SIRMONS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

